

REMARKS

INTRODUCTION

In accordance with the foregoing, claims 6 and 11 have been amended. Claims 12-14 have been cancelled. Claims 1-5 and 15-21 have been withdrawn. Claims 6-11 are pending and under consideration.

CLAIM REJECTIONS – 112

Claims 6-14 were rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Specifically, the Examiner noted that several of the features in independent claims 6 and 11 were unclear. Appropriate correction has been made to claims 6 and 11 to clarify the claims.

The Examiner's queries are below, including answers and support from the specification for the amendments made to claim 6:

Who is storing the security information? The security server, as per paragraph [0030].

Who is transmitting the security information and document data? The transmitting facsimile machine, as per paragraph [0028].

Who is receiving user information on a user attempting to print? The receiving facsimile machine, as per paragraph [0029].

Who is printing the document data? The receiving facsimile machine, as per paragraph [0029].

Regarding claim 11, claim 11 has been amended to recite a computer-readable medium encoded with processing instructions implementing the method of claim 6.

Claims 7-10 are believed to be definite as they depend from claim 6. Claims 12-14 have been cancelled.

Withdrawal of the foregoing rejections is requested.

CLAIM REJECTIONS -- 103

Claims 6-14 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over DeBry (US 6,385,728) (hereinafter "DeBry") in view of Stodder et al. (US 5,727,890) (hereinafter "Stodder").

Claims 6-10

Amended claim 6 recites: "...wherein the security information is transmitted via a security communication line different from a communication line that transmits the document data from the transmitting facsimile machine to the receiving facsimile machine." Support for the amendments to claim 6 may be found in at least paragraphs [0028] – [0030] of the specification.

The Office Action relies on 9:66-10:5 of DeBry to show this feature of claim 6. This section of DeBry notes that: "In one embodiment, it should be noted that the secret key built into the printer and stored in the database of the authority is only used between the printer and the authority for generating digital certificates. In such an embodiment, the secret key is not used for any other communications using traditional symmetric cryptography." DeBry, 9:66-10:5.

It is respectfully submitted that this section of DeBry only discusses that there is a separate communication link between the printer and the digital certificate authority. In DeBry, all of the communications 2, 3, 4 and 5 (including the encrypted will call certificate) appear to be through the same line or medium. By contrast, claim 6 recites that the security information is transmitted -- from the transmitting facsimile machine to the receiving facsimile machine -- via a security communication line different from a communication line that transmits the document data from the transmitting facsimile machine to the receiving facsimile machine.

Further, this deficiency in DeBry is not cured by Stodder.

This technical feature of claim 6 allows for authorized users to be authenticated to print predetermined document data even when transmitting and receiving facsimile machines do not share the same manufacturer or the same protocol, which is a technical advantage not realized by DeBry.

Claims 7-10 depend on claim 6 and are therefore believed to be allowable for at least the foregoing reasons.

Withdrawal of the foregoing rejections is requested.

Claims 11-14

Amended claim 11 recites a computer-readable medium encoded with processing instructions implementing the method of claim 6. Accordingly, claim 11 is believed to be allowable for the above noted reasons regarding claim 6. Claims 12-14 have been cancelled.

Withdrawal of the foregoing rejections is requested.

CONCLUSION

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: May 21, 2008

By: Gregory W. Harper
Gregory W. Harper
Registration No. 55,248

1201 New York Avenue, N.W., 7th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501